

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

Please amend FIGURES 4 and 5 as indicated on the annotated sheets. The amendments to FIGURES 4 and 5 correct typographical errors in the respective drawings. Applicants have also included replacement sheets depicting how FIGURES 4 and 5 should appear after the amendments have been entered. No new matter has been added.

LAW OFFICES OF
CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESS^{PLLC}
1420 Fifth Avenue
Suite 2800
Seattle, Washington 98101
206.682.8100

REMARKS

I. Introduction

Claims 1-58 are pending in the present application. In a November 17, 2005, Office Action (herein "Office Action") Claims 1-3, 7, 9-14, 19, 32-39, 42, 45, and 47-58, were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,188,973 to Martinez et al. (herein "Martinez"). Claims 4-6, 15-18, 20-22, 24, 25, 40, 41, and 43, were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Martinez in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,714,977 to Fowler et al. (herein "Fowler"). Additionally, Claims 8, 23, 26, and 44, were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Martinez in view of Fowler and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,429,893 to Xin (herein "Xin"). Claim 27 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Martinez in view of Fowler in view of Xin and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,219,439 to Burger (herein "Burger"). Finally, Claims 28-31 and 46, were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Martinez in view of Fowler in view of Burger.

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejected claims of the present application are not anticipated nor obvious over Martinez, Fowler, Xin or Burger, alone or in combination, because the cited and applied references fail to teach or suggest a central server that obtains monitoring device data from a number of geographically distinct sites and processes, at the central server, monitoring device data from each site according to specific monitoring device rules which establish a threshold for the monitoring device data. Prior to discussing more detailed reasons why applicants believe that all the claims of the present invention are allowable, a brief description of the present invention and the primary cited reference are presented.

LAW OFFICES OF
CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESS^{PLLC}
1420 Fifth Avenue
Suite 2800
Seattle, Washington 98101
206.682.8100

A. Summary of the Present Invention

The present application is directed toward a system and method for implementing a configurable security monitoring system for a plurality of remote monitoring sites. In accordance with an illustrative embodiment of the present invention, the integrated information portal includes a number of monitoring devices located at geographically distinct sites that produce monitoring device data for a defined monitoring target. The integrated information system also includes a central server that obtains monitoring device data from the monitoring devices and processes the monitoring device data according to a set of monitoring rules. The monitoring rules may be defined according to the type of monitoring device data that is received. Based on the evaluation of the monitoring rules, the central server generates outputs in the form of communication to one or more authorized users via a variety of communication mediums and devices and/or the initiation of actions as specified in the monitoring rules.

Numerous advantages may be realized by the method and system recited in the present application. In one aspect, the central server can utilize the monitoring rules to customize processing of monitoring device data for individual sites or a group of sites. In another aspect, the central server can be configured to process the monitoring device data without requiring processing capabilities at the sites. In still another aspect of the present invention, the central server can utilize the various monitoring device rules to selectively process the same monitoring device data for a variety of premises servers by applying different monitoring device rules. Still further, the central server can generate approximate outputs without direct access to the monitoring devices. Additional advantages may also be realized within the present invention.

B. U.S. Patent No. 6,188,973 ("Martinez et al.")

Martinez is purportedly directed toward a system and method for automatically mapping on a computer display a graphical representation of a physical arrangement of a plurality of

computer components in one or more cabinets. *See Martinez, abstract.* Generally described, Martinez teaches a system wherein location and status data of various components are monitored by an environmental monitoring unit (EMU). *See Col. 6, line 67-Col. 7, line 20.* The location and status data may be graphically displayed on a graphical user interface (GUI). *See Col. 12, lines 39-41.* Martinez further teaches that, although monitored data may be graphically displayed on the GUI, the components themselves actually process and respond to the monitored data. *See Col. 11, lines 18-39.* Accordingly, Martinez fails to teach or suggest a centralized server component that obtains monitoring device data from monitoring devices at geographically distinct sites and processes the data according to various monitoring device rules. Martinez further fails to teach or suggest characterizing the monitoring device data as asset, resource or event data.

C. U.S. Patent No. 6,714,977 ("Fowler et al.")

Fowler is purportedly directed toward a system and method for monitoring an enclosed space over a communication network. Generally described, Fowler teaches the utilization of various low cost, independent monitoring components (e.g., "bots"), that monitor and report various conditions associated with a monitored space. Each bot is specifically configured to monitor specific parameters, such as a climate bot, a video climate bot, a net bot, etc. In turn, each bot processes raw monitored data and provides processed data to a user over a communication network. Thus, Fowler is directed toward a de-centralized monitoring environment. Fowler, however fails to teach or suggest a centralized server component that obtains monitoring device data from monitoring devices at geographically distinct sites and processes the data according to various monitoring device rules. Fowler further fails to teach or suggest characterizing the monitoring device data as asset, resource or event data.

II. The Claims Distinguished

A. Claim 1

Claim 1, as currently amended, reads as follows:

1. In an integrated information system including a central server in communication with two or more geographically distinct sites, a method for processing monitoring device data, the method comprising:

obtaining monitoring device data from the two or more geographically distinct sites, wherein the monitoring device data corresponds to at least one monitoring device at each geographically distinct site;

obtaining one or more monitoring rules corresponding to the at least one monitoring device, wherein the one or more rules establish a threshold for the monitoring device data to be evaluated at the central server;

processing the monitoring device data at the central server according to the monitoring rules; and

generating an output corresponding to the processing of the monitoring device data, wherein the output may include no output.

As described above, the present application is directed toward a system and method for implementing a configurable security monitoring system for a plurality of remote monitoring sites. The monitoring rules may be utilized to monitor geographically distinct sites that can be associated with any number of monitoring devices associated with the sites. However, by processing the monitoring device data at a centralized server according to the monitoring rules, the present invention, as recited in Claim 1, provides a centralized and customizable monitoring system. Further, the monitoring rules establish a threshold for the monitoring device data to be evaluated at the central server. Additionally, the present invention does not require multiple software applications or components at each site to process monitoring device data.

In contrast to the claims of the present invention, Martinez is directed toward a system and method for automatically mapping on a computer display a graphical representation of a physical arrangement of a plurality of computer components in one or more cabinets. *See*

Martinez, abstract. Specifically, Martinez describes a computer system with various cabinets, each cabinet having one or more shelves, with each shelf containing a variety of components and an environmental monitoring unit (EMU). *See* Martinez, Col 5, lines 12-15. Martinez further describes a graphical user interface (GUI) for mapping components to their physical location in the system. *See* Col. 4, lines 60-65.

Martinez further describes a system in which the GUI "provides user control of the components within the computing system." *See* Col. 11, lines 28-30. A user may issue a command through the GUI to "adjust a warning or shutdown set point value" of a component. *See* Col. 11, lines 30-32. However, Martinez clearly does not teach the recited limitation of "processing the monitoring device data at the central server according to the monitoring rules" because any "warning[s] or shut down set point value[s]" are processed by the monitored components themselves. As taught in Martinez:

A set point value could include a temperature at which the power supply within the shelf disables output power to the shelf, for example. These thresholds can include a warning threshold, wherein the component generates a warning signal ultimately passed to the GUI, or a critical threshold wherein the component takes some critical action to prevent catastrophic system failures.

See Col. 11, lines 32-40. Clearly, Martinez teaches that the monitored components, and not a central server, processes the monitoring data and then acts accordingly.

In response to previous arguments submitted by the applicants, the Office Action asserts that:

Martinez's EMU passes monitored information to the GUI 36 and PC/server 32 through the communication link 38 *for processing by the GUI 36*. This information is evaluated by the GUI by the monitoring rules (i.e., whether to change the display and how) and then an output is generated (i.e., the warning signal). This rule is not evaluated by the EMU since the EMU is merely a gateway for the devices and monitors environmental conditions of the shelf. This clearly shows that the information is processed by the central server (i.e., the PC 32 running the GUI 36).

See Office Action, p. 16. (Emphasis in original). In response to the Office Action, applicants have amended Claim 1 to recite that the monitoring rules and the threshold established by the monitoring rules are evaluated at a central server. In contrast, Martinez teaches a distributed system in which remote components, as opposed to a centralized server, generate output and take action based on processing by the remote components of warning and critical thresholds. *See* Martinez, Col. 11, lines 32-40.

As described, Martinez fails to teach or suggest a central server that processes monitoring device data from two or more geographically distinct sites. Additionally, Martinez fails to teach monitoring rules which establish a threshold for the monitoring device data to be evaluated at the central server. Instead, Martinez is clearly directed toward a de-centralized embodiment in which monitoring device data is acquired and processed by individual components. Thus, Martinez fails to teach or suggest "processing the monitoring device data at the central server according to the monitoring rules" as recited in Claim 1. Additionally, Martinez fails to teach or suggest "one or more monitoring rules corresponding to at least one monitoring device, wherein the one or more rules establish a threshold for the monitoring device data to be evaluated at the central server." Because Martinez fails to teach each limitation recited in Claim 1, applicants respectfully request a withdrawal of the § 102(e) rejection of Claim 1.

B. Claims 2-33

Claims 2-33 depend on independent Claim 1. As discussed above, Martinez fails to teach or suggest processing monitoring device data from two or more geographically distinct sites according to monitoring rules which establish a threshold for the monitoring device data to be evaluated at the central server. Accordingly, for the above-mentioned reasons, Claims 2-33 are allowable over Martinez. Additionally, applicants respectfully submit the additionally cited references, Fowler, Xin and Burger, fail to teach or suggest the deficiencies associated with

Martinez. Accordingly, Claims 2-33 are allowable over Martinez, Fowler, Xin and Burger, alone or in combination. Additionally, Claims 2-33 further add to the non-obviousness of applicants' invention, the details of which are discussed below.

Claim 3 adds to the nonobviousness of applicants' invention limitations related to characterizing device data as asset data, resource data or event data. Claim 6 further adds to the nonobviousness of applicants' invention obtaining monitoring rules corresponding to the characterization of the monitoring device data. The Office Action asserts that Martinez teaches these limitations because "the data must be characterized since thresholds pertaining to a smoke alarm setting would not be useful for a humidity sensor reading data." Applicants respectfully assert that Martinez in no way teaches any type of characterization of monitoring device data. Instead, each component in the system taught by Martinez is configured specifically to provide status and location data. *See* Martinez, Col. 12, lines 39-41. Provided that each component provides its status and location, there would be no need to characterize the incoming type of monitoring device data and associate monitoring rules according to the characterization as recited in Claims 3 and 6. This point is further accentuated by the fact that Martinez is limited to a monitoring system in which there is no centralized processing of monitoring device data. Accordingly, applicants further assert that Martinez, alone or in combination with Fowler, Xin or Burger, fails to teach or suggest the additional limitations of Claim 3 or Claim 6 and their respective dependent claims.

In regards to Claims 15-17, the Office Action took "Official Notice" that "both the concept and advantages of providing for maintaining a schedule of preferred notification methods based on a time of day and preferred notification methods for each designated user is well known and expected in the art." Further, in regards to Claim 25, the Office Action took "Official Notice" that "both the concept and advantages of providing for a network access

LAW OFFICES OF
CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESS^{PLLC}
1420 Fifth Avenue
Suite 2800
Seattle, Washington 98101
206.682.8100

monitor to identify users on a network is well known and expected in the art." Applicants acknowledge the Office Action's assertion of prior art on p. 17, paragraph 33, but respectfully disagree. Further, applicants request that a reference be cited if the rejections are repeated. Alternatively, if the rejections rely on "general knowledge" or "specific knowledge" of the Examiner, applicants respectfully request that the Examiner's affidavit be submitted.

C. Claims 34-47

In a manner similar to independent Claim 1, independent Claim 34, as amended, recites a central processing server that obtains monitoring device data from two or more geographically distinct sites. Claim 34 also recites that the central processing server processes monitoring device data from the two or more geographically distinct sites according to processing rules. As discussed above with respect to independent Claim 1, Martinez fails to teach or suggest processing monitoring device data from two or more geographically distinct sites at the central server according to the monitoring rules. In contrast, Martinez is limited to teaching a monitoring environment in which individual monitoring components obtain and process monitoring data. Because Martinez fails to teach each limitation recited in Claim 34, applicants respectfully request a withdrawal of the § 102(e) rejection of Claim 34.

Claims 35-47 depend on independent Claim 34. Accordingly, for the above-mentioned reasons, applicants submit that Claims 35-47 are allowable over Martinez. Additionally, Claim 37 adds to the nonobviousness of applicants' invention that the monitoring device data is characterized as asset data, resource data or event data. As discussed above with respect to Claims 3 and 6, applicants further assert that Martinez fails to teach or suggest the characterization of the monitoring device data and the selection of processing rules according to the characterization. Therefore, Claim 37 and its dependent claims are further allowable over the cited applied art.

LAW OFFICES OF
CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESS^{PLLC}
1420 Fifth Avenue
Suite 2800
Seattle, Washington 98101
206.682.8100

D. Claims 48-58

In a manner similar to independent Claims 1 and 34, independent Claim 48 recites central processing means for obtaining the monitoring device data from two or more geographically distinct sites and processing the monitoring device data according to one or more monitoring device rules. As discussed above with respect to independent Claims 1 and 34, Martinez fails to teach or suggest processing monitoring device data from two or more geographically distinct sites at the central server according to the monitoring rules. In contrast, Martinez is limited to teaching a monitoring environment in which individual monitoring components obtain and process monitoring data. Because Martinez fails to teach each limitation recited in Claim 48, applicants respectfully request a withdrawal of the § 102(e) rejection of Claim 48.

Claims 49-58 depend on independent Claim 48. Accordingly, for the above-mentioned reasons, applicants submit that Claims 49-58 are allowable over Martinez. Additionally, Claims 51 adds to the nonobviousness of applicants' invention that the monitoring device data is characterized as asset data, resource data or event data. As discussed above with respect to Claims 3, 6 and 37, applicants further assert that Martinez fails to teach or suggest the characterization of the monitoring device data and the selection of processing rules according to the characterization. Therefore, Claim 51 and its dependent claims are further allowable over the cited applied art.

LAW OFFICES OF
CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESS^{PLC}
1420 Fifth Avenue
Suite 2800
Seattle, Washington 98101
206.682.8100

III. Conclusion

Based on the above-referenced arguments, applicants respectfully submit that all of the claims of the present application, Claims 1-58, are allowable over the cited and applied references. Because the cited and applied references fail to teach or suggest a central server that obtains monitoring device data from two or more geographically distinct sites and processes the monitoring device data at the central server according to specific monitoring device rules, applicants respectfully request a withdrawal of the rejection of all the claims of the present application and allowance of the present application. If any questions remain, applicants request that the Examiner contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR
JOHNSON KINDNESS^{PLLC}

Mauricio A. Uribe S3,594
for

Mauricio A. Uribe
Registration No. 46,206
Direct Dial No. 206.695.1728

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service in a sealed envelope as first class mail with postage thereon fully prepaid and addressed to Mail Stop RCE, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on the below date.

Date: 5/17/06

Jacquie Brown

MAU:jlB

LAW OFFICES OF
CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESS^{PLLC}
1420 Fifth Avenue
Suite 2800
Seattle, Washington 98101
206.682.8100